REMARKS

The office action and references cited therein have been carefully considered and amendments have been made to the claims of the application to more accurately define the present invention and to emphasize pre-existing differences between the invention as claimed and the prior art that has been cited and applied. Additionally, amendments have been made to correct the informalities that were indicated by the examiner. Applicants agree with the informalities that were noted and have made the suggested correction of them.

The examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 7, 9, 12, 13, 15, 16 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the Internationalizing the Sample Program reference which will hereinafter be referred to merely as the "Internationalizing" reference. Claims 5, 6, 22 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over the Internationalizing reference in view of Yamamoto and claims 8, 10, 11 and 17-19 were similarly rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over the Internationalizing reference in view of Schultz. Finally, claims 14 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over the Internationalizing reference.

The specification of the present application indicates that as a result of the Internet, global communication is commonplace for most business interactions and it is currently typical that a file be required to be available in multiple languages. At the time of the present invention, most localizations are done on a page level basis meaning each and every page is stored in different language versions. As indicated at pages 1 and 2 of the application, when full pages are provided in multiple languages,

each page in each language generally constitutes a separate file which is not a particularly scalable solution. The code size is directly proportional to a number of languages, so that storage memory is therefore used in an inefficient manner. Additionally, use of such multiple files makes revisions to these files and pages very time-consuming and error prone since each file must be separately revised. The system described in the present application provides a relatively simple and efficient way of providing a file in multiple languages.

The system defined in claim 1 comprises a file having text for displaying in multiple languages, a string identifier for uniquely identifying each text in said file, a language identifier for uniquely identifying each language available for said file, and a localized string for displaying text uniquely defined by said string identifier and said language identifier, among other elements. It is important to recognize that a localized string for displaying text is *uniquely defined by said string identifier and said language identifier*. This is believed to be very different than the program described in the Internationalizing reference for several reasons. The Internationalizing reference creates a properties file that requires not only a language but also a *country* in addition to the "translatable text" of the message to be displayed.

From the translatable text, the language and the country, the Internationalizing reference then creates a MessagesBundle properties file, which is then used to create a ResourceBundle. To obtain the text from the ResourceBundle, key-value pairs must be specified when fetching the translated messages from the ResourceBundle. All of these steps are believed to be very different from the system that is set forth in amended claim 1 wherein a localized string is uniquely defined by

9

said string identifier and said language identifier. The increased simplicity believed to be important in reducing the amount of storage memory that is required for a given text file. Reconsideration and allowance of amended claim 1 is respectfully requested.

The method of claim 12 is similarly distinguishable over the Internationalizing reference for the reason that it has the step of returning the localized string uniquely designated by the string identifier and specified language. The system of claim 21 has means for returning the localized string uniquely designated by the string identifier and specified language which is not taught or suggested by the initializing Internationalizing reference.

Similarly, the computer program product claims 22 and 23 include the element of returning the localized string uniquely designated by the string identifier and specified language.

Yamamoto fails to provide the deficiency of the Internationalizing reference and Schultz operates similarly to the Internationalizing reference in that it requires language as well as a country designation in addition to translatable text and therefore suffers from the same deficiency as the Internationalizing reference.

Since the dependent claims necessarily include the features of the claims from which they depend, in addition to defining other features or functionality not found in the claims from which they depend, it is believed that the dependent claims are also in condition for immediate allowance.

In conclusion, none of the references, applied singularly or in combination are believed to teach or suggest the claims that are presently pending in

the application. Reconsideration and allowance of all claims presently pending in the application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By

Roger D. Greer
Registration No. 26,174

February 21, 2005

300 South Wacker Drive, Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 360-0080
Customer No. 24978